C. REMARKS

Claims 1-18 remain pending. No claims have been added or canceled with this amendment. Claims 1, 14, and 18 have been amended herein to further clarify that the determining step and means further determines if the at least one prerequisite resource has been previously requested by the requester. However, this amendment is not necessary to overcome the art cited by the examiner. As such, the remarks below overcome the examiner's rejections without reliance on this element. The element is being added merely to make the claimed invention more clear on its face. It could be further argued, however, that the art relied on by the examiner does not also do this element in conjunction with the other claimed elements.

Applicants' Attorney appreciates the telephone discussion with the examiner on November 5, 2003. In that discussion, Dutta 6539424 was discussed. The examiner pointed out 404, Fig. 4 of Dutta. Applicants' attorney pointed out that Dutta does not combine content into a different resource. The examiner stated that the claims are clear on sending a different resource which combines content from a requested resource and a pre-requisite resource.

The examiner rejects claims 1-12 and 14-16 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephen Downes "Deep Links" hereinafter "Downes". Downes teaches away from Applicants' claimed invention in two separate ways. First, Downes teaches redirection on page 1, paragraph 3 such that if a user deep links into a web site the user will be automatically redirected to the front page if that user is entering the site from an

PAGE 10/16 * RCVD AT 2/16/2004 2:23:14 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/2 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:512 823 1036 * DURATION (mm-ss):05-34

outside site. Second, Downes teaches placing advertising banners (which the examiner must presume to be pre-requisite resources) on each and every content page of the website - page 2, paragraph 6 which states "most sites which are supported via advertisements place banners on each of their content pages. That is, each content page contains a banner advertisement. Downes does not teach or suggest that there be a given content page without a banner advertisement and that same given content with a banner advertisement. As such, Downes does not teach or suggest the steps of "determining if the resource requires at least one prerequisite resource, and sending a different resource if the requested resource requires the prerequisite resource" since the requested resource of Downes already includes the banner advertisement. There is no "different" resource in Downes. It is the same resource since the banner advertisement is added to every content page already. Downes does not teach or suggest having two different content pages where one is the requested content and the different resource is the requested content combined with the prerequisite content as claimed in Applicants' claimed invention by the words "the resource" and "a different resource". Downes does not teach or suggest "a resource" and "a different resource". Downes just has one resource that now has the content and the banner advertisement with it. As such, Downes has no need for, and therefore does not teach or suggest the determining step of Applicants' claimed invention.

Since Downes does not teach or suggest each and every element of Applicants' claimed invention as found in each of the claims 1-18, then these claims are not obvious

PAGE 11/16 * RCVD AT 2/16/2004 2:23:14 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/2 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:512 823 1036 * DURATION (mm-ss):05-34

under 35 USC 103 by Downes. As such, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn and claims 1-18 be allowed.

With respect to claims 2-7, and 15 and 16, the examiner further admits that Downes does not disclose keeping track of each request made for a prerequisite resource for each requester within a tracking parameter. Although the examiner states that this is well known in the art, Applicants submit that the use of tracking to determine if a prerequisite resource is required and sending a different resource having a content combining the content with prerequisite content was not known before Applicants' invention and was not suggested by Downes since there was no motivation to do tracking as in the claimed invention since Downes has the prerequisite resource on each and every content page. Therefore, the examiner must be using hindsight with the benefit of Applicants' disclosure since Downes lacks the motivation or need to do this element.

With respect to claim 8, the examiner states that Downes discloses determining which at least one resource is the at least one prerequisite resource. At best, Downes may make such determination but it is at the time of the creation of the web site and all of the content pates, and not at the time that a request for the resource is received as claimed in Applicants' claimed invention.

With respect to claims 9-12, claims 9-12 depend from claim 1 which have been shown above not to have been obvious, and thus are not obvious for the same reasons.

With respect to claims 13, 17, and 18, the examiner has rejected these claims under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Downes as applied to claims 1-12 and 14-16

PAGE 12/16 * RCVD AT 2/16/2004 2:23:14 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/2 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:512 823 1036 * DURATION (mm-ss):05-34

and further in view of Nakamura (6,591,248 B1). The examiner admits that Downes does not disclose the requested resource can be reached by following links from the another resource content. Applicants could find no teaching in Nakamura, either at col4, lines 29-44, or elsewhere, that teach or suggest claims 13, 17, 18. To teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention, the banner ad would have to contain links to the requested content. Instead, Nakamura appears to be teaching away from Applicants' claimed invention by showing that the banner ad contains links to the advertisement provider (col 4, line 44) which is not to the requested content as claimed in Applicants' claimed invention.

With respect to claim 18, Applicants submit that this claim is nonobvious for the reasons stated above with respect to the other similar claims.

As such, neither Downes nor Nakamura, either alone or in combination teach or suggest Applicants claimed invention for the reasons stated above. As such, the examiner's rejection has been overcome, and Applicants respectfully request that claims 1-18 be allowed.

Applicants' attorney has reviewed the art made of record but not relied upon (Angles et al 6,385,592))and deems it not teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention. Angles adds an advertisement to each page requested, and does not determine if a prerequisite page is needed when a resource is requested. Angles assumes an advertisement is needed each time and then determines which advertisement to send.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and the allowance of the current pending claims is respectfully requested.

PAGE 13/16 * RCVD AT 2/16/2004 2:23:14 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/2 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:512 823 1036 * DURATION (mm-ss):05-34

Applicants request a telephone interview with the examiner. An Applicant Initiated Interview Request is attached hereto.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Smith Dawkins

Marilyn Smith Dawkins
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 31,140
(512) 823-0094

PAGE 14/16 * RCVD AT 2/16/2004 2:23:14 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/2 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:512 823 1036 * DURATION (mm-ss):05-34